

## REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated December 5, 2006 and Advisory Action dated February 20, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-11 and 13-35 are pending in the present Application. Claims 4-6, 19-32, 34 and 35 have been previously withdrawn from consideration and claim 12 has been previously canceled. Applicants are grateful for the Examiner's indication that claims 15-17 have allowable subject matter. Claims 1-3, 7-11, 13 and 33 have been amended and claims 36-38 are new, leaving claims 1-3, 7-11, 13, 14-18, 33 and 36-38 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment and following remarks.

Support for the claim amendments are at least found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1, 13 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner states that the limitation "at least one of the gate lines and the data lines located adjacent to the white pixel has a line width larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate and data lines" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear to the Examiner how the gate line or data line located adjacent to the white pixel would have a line width larger than another portion of the line.

Claims 1, 13 and 33 have been previously amended to make clear that **portions** of the gate and/or data lines adjacent to the white pixel WP have a wider line width than other portions of the corresponding gate and data lines. These previous amendments were not made to

overcome any of the cited references. The previous amendments are in accordance with claim 10 and as admittedly understood by the Examiner as indicated on page 3 of the Detailed Action.

Accordingly, Applicant is grateful for withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1, 13 and 33 under § 112, as indicated in the February 20, 2007 Advisory Action.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-3 and 7-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Tsutomu (Japanese Patent No. 2001-296523, hereinafter "Tsutomu") in view of Yoshida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,212, hereinafter "Yoshida"). The Examiner states that Tsutomu discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *each pixel including a pixel electrode and a switching element, and at least one of the gate lines and the data lines located adjacent to the white pixel has a line width larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate and data lines*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 6, column 8, lines 25-45 of Yoshida. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 as amended, from which claims 2, 3 and 7-9 depend, recite, *inter alia*: wherein a portion of at least one of the gate lines and the data lines located adjacent to the white pixel has a line width larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate and data lines. Neither Tsutomu nor Yoshida, either alone or in combination, disclose any variance in a line width of the gate or data lines. Thus, claim 1, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2, 3 and 7-11, define over Tsutomu in view of Yoshida.

However, the Examiner alleges on page 5 of the Detailed Action that Yoshida discloses with respect to FIG. 6 and column 8, lines 25-45 that at least one of the gate lines and the data lines located adjacent to the white pixel has a line width larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate lines and the data lines. In particular, the Examiner alleges that Figure 6 of Yoshida shows that the projections from the data lines 32 shown as 42 are larger than the width of the rest of the data lines, and also the width of the gates lines 36 are larger at portion 40 than the other portions of the gates lines.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner improperly characterizes FIG. 6 of Yoshida. More specifically, it is respectfully submitted that FIG. 6 of Yoshida more accurately discloses a

drain electrode 42 of TFT 38 extending from the data line 32 and a gate electrode 40 of TFT 38 extending from the gate line 36. Moreover, FIG. 6 of Yoshida discloses the drain electrode 42 having a width substantially the same as the width of the data line 32, although extending substantially perpendicular thereto. Likewise, FIG. 6 of Yoshida discloses the gate electrode 40 having a width substantially the same as the width of the gate line 36, although extending substantially perpendicular thereto. In other words, the drain electrode 42 extends from the data line 32 in a direction substantially perpendicular to the data line 32 and thus a width of the drain electrode 42 is now perpendicular to the width of the data line 32.

In addition, there is no teaching or suggestion in Yoshida of “white pixels” or that the projections 42 and 40 relied upon by the Examiner are adjacent to white pixels such that a line width corresponding to the gate line and or data line adjacent to the white pixel is “larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate and data lines” corresponding to the other primary color pixels.

Still further, FIG. 6 and column 8, lines 25-45 relied upon by the Examiner disclose that a TFT 38 is formed at the intersection between the gate line 36 and the data line 32 and that the TFT 38 includes the gate electrode 40 and the drain electrode 42. (Col. 8, lines 26-29). Therefore, each pixel has a TFT 38 having the projections 40 and 42 relied upon by the Examiner, as is well known in the prior art. Therefore, Yoshida does not teach or suggest that the white pixels are smaller than the other primary color pixels as a result of a portion of the data line 32 or portion of the gate line 36 adjacent to the white pixels being wider than other portions of the respective data line 32 and/or gate line 36.

In the February 20, 2007 Advisory Action, the Examiner still maintains the that “portions of lines corresponding to these TFTs will be larger width than the rest of the lines” and that Tsutomu is used to teach “white pixels being smaller than one of the primary colors” and concludes that the combination of Yoshida and Tsutomu does teach the claimed invention. The Examiner attempts to buttress this last point by stating that “[t]he claim does not say that the larger portions of the data lines and gate lines cannot be those corresponding to a TFT and therefore the teaching of Yoshida can be applied to teach the claims.”

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir.

1988). Establishing a prima facie case of obviousness requires that all elements of the invention be disclosed in the prior art. *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970).

In the instant case, neither Tsutomu nor Yoshida, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest that the larger line width portion of the data or gate lines is located adjacent to the white pixel (i.e., no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in either Tsutomu or Yoshida that projection 42 of Yoshida is located adjacent to the white pixel).

In particular, neither Tsutomu nor Yoshida, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest wherein a portion of at least one of the gate lines and the data lines located adjacent to the white pixel has a line width larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate and data lines, as in amended independent claim 1 and similarly claimed in amended independent claims 13 and 33. Thus, claim 1, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2, 3 and 7-11, define over Tsutomu in view of Yoshida for at least the above reasons.

Claims 13 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Tanioka (U.S. Patent No. 5,929,843, hereinafter "Tanioka") in view of Yoshida. The Examiner states that Tanioka discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *at least one of the gate lines and the data lines located adjacent to the white pixel has a line width larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate and data lines*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 6, column 8, lines 25-45 of Yoshida. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in Yoshida of "white pixels" or that the projections 42 and 40 relied upon by the Examiner are adjacent to white pixels such that a line width corresponding to the gate line and or data line adjacent to the white pixel is "larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate and data lines" corresponding to the other primary color pixels.

Still further, FIG. 6 and column 8, lines 25-45 relied upon by the Examiner disclose that a TFT 38 is formed at the intersection between the gate line 36 and the data line 32 and that the TFT 38 includes the gate electrode 40 and the drain electrode 42. (Col. 8, lines 26-29). Therefore, each pixel has a TFT 38 having the projections 40 and 42 relied upon by the Examiner, as is well known in the prior art. Therefore, Yoshida does not teach or suggest that

the white pixels are smaller than the other primary color pixels as a result of a portion of the data line 32 or portion of the gate line 36 adjacent to the white pixels being wider than that other portions of the respective data line 32 and/or gate line 36.

In particular, neither Tanioka nor Yoshida, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest wherein a portion of at least one of the gate lines and the data lines located adjacent to the white pixel has a line width larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate lines and the data lines, as in amended independent claim 13 and similarly claimed in amended independent claim 33. Thus, claims 13 and 33, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 14-18, define over Tanioka in view of Yoshida for at least the above reasons.

Claims 14 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Tanioka in view of Yoshida and further in view of Morita (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0196243, hereinafter "Morita"). The Examiner states that Tanioka discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *supplying the image signals to the data driver in synchronization with a clock; and a clock generator generating the clock, the data driver operating in synchronization with the clock*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in paragraph 239 of Morita. Applicants respectfully traverse.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 14 and 18 depend from claim 13, which is submitted as being allowable for defining over Tanioka in view of Yoshida as discussed above. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that use of the alleged teachings of Morita do not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Tanioka and Yoshida. More specifically, neither Tanioka, Yoshida nor Morita, either alone or in combination teach or suggest wherein a portion of at least one of the gate lines and the data lines located adjacent to the white pixel has a line width larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate lines and the data lines, as in amended claim 13 from which claim 14 depends. Thus claim 14, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 15-18, define over Tanioka and Yoshida in view of Morita.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 1-3, 7-11, 13, 14, 18 and 33 under §103(a) be withdrawn.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 15-17 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's noting the allowable subject matter in claims 15-17, but Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15-17 are allowable as depending upon allowable claim 13. As such, Applicant has not rewritten claims 15-17 in independent form at this time.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/  
James J. Merrick 43,801  
Confirmation No. 5378  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: April 5, 2007